



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

At first blush this method of formulating judgments seems unlikely to secure results of sufficient definiteness and accuracy; especially when, casting the eye down the lists, one observes grouped in grade 5 for intellect, Louis XVI. of France, Emperor Leopold II., a clever, cautious politician, Emperor Rudolf II., a dull bigot, Frederick William IV. of Prussia, who whatever his limitations as a man of action, was remarkably gifted in many ways, and the late Emperor Frederick of Germany. Again, any rating for morals which puts Frederick William I., Frederick the Great, and the Great Elector of Prussia in grades 3, 4, and 5 respectively and accords to Emperor Francis II. of Austria the distinction of 7, seems open to grave question.

However, the arrangement of the broad classes of geniuses, imbeciles, lunatics, degenerates and mediocrities is a simpler and easier matter than these more sharply drawn classifications, and in the main suffices for the author's enquiry.

Applying this broad classification to the pedigrees of the royal personages under review, the author concludes that the results obtained correspond in the main with Galton's law based on certain physical attributes in animals, that heredity accounts more satisfactorily for the appearance of genius or the reverse than environment or opportunity, that the inbreeding of families may be beneficial when the stocks can be graded high and are free from taint, that great power of mind and high character are more often found associated than separate, that the able and the noble are more apt to have numerous offspring than the intellectually feeble and the morally degraded, pointing thus to the survival of the fittest and the elevation of the race. Even if his conclusions be accepted in full, however, environment remains a force to be reckoned with. Doubtless some genius now and then breaks the leashes of circumstance as fast as they are laid upon him, with no apparent loss in the development of his speed. Others get into the running only occasionally. And it is scarcely open to question that others never shake themselves loose from these bonds at all.

The author has done his work with skill and good judgment and his book will be especially profitable for reproof and instruction to political doctrinaires of every school.

Études Sociales et Juridiques sur l'Antiquité Grecque. Par GUSTAVE GLOTZ. (Paris: Hachette et Cie. 1906. Pp. 303.)

THE protection of life, property, and race purity belonged at first to the clan (*genos*). The parricide, the adulteress, and the erring maid were left to the anger of the clan gods—the only gods there were. They became by excommunication outcasts, unless they proved their innocence by an appeal to the ordeal, or judgment of god. The killing of a foreigner, on the other hand, started a feud, or war between the clans, which could be ended only by the blood-covenant. Then, in the Greek Middle

Ages, a change came about, and the clan law was extended with the clan gods to the whole community. Thus the pollution, which earlier involved only the clan of the fratricide, if it failed to cast him out now affected the whole city, and this religious idea armed the state with the authority needful for the punishment of the murderer. So M. Glotz (pp. 1-67; 277-300). The reader is impelled to ask: Is it true that two views of early Greek development—the Sophists' opposites—are equally tenable, the one making men gregarious (*ζῶα πολιτικά*) at the start, the other presenting them to us in family groups, solitary like beasts of prey: the one making the brotherhood (*phratry*) the chief minor group of the political herd, the other regarding the clan (*genos*) as originally a state in itself: the one letting the brotherhood disintegrate and the clans rise in its midst through the accumulation of property in the hands of a few, the other seeing in the later nobles *all* the earlier citizens, the serfs being immigrants or conquered peoples? If it is true that these two opinions can be maintained by equally conclusive arguments, then historians will do well to withdraw from this field altogether. If it is not true, the reader must insist that a Socrates—say in the person of Eduard Meyer (*Gesch. d. Altertums*, II. 79 ff.; 291 ff.; *Forsch. z. alt. Gesch.*, II. 517 ff.)—is required to interrupt M. Glotz's facile exposition, and ask him some questions. How came it that the clan had nothing whatever to do with the enforcement of the criminal law of Draco? The clans coalesced in the Greek Middle Ages (after Homer): in a few generations this amazing revolution (p. 287) took place. What were men doing in the thousands of generations prior to 800 B.C.? What great force came into Greek life in the Middle Ages that was not previously operative? Homer, it must be remarked, knows no isolated clans. Was not Alcinoos' people divided into thirteen tribes and fifty-two brotherhoods (pp. 239 ff.)? Were the clans isolated when the mountaineers, marshalled in the three Doric tribes (p. 223), conquered the Peloponnese? Did they lack community of action in the Mycenaean Age, when the great road was built from Mycenae to Corinth, and Cnossus ruled the seas? Perhaps their day belongs before 1500 B. C. If so, M. Glotz should have operated with Schrader's *Lexicon*, and not so much with those will-o'-the-wisps, Greek myths. To the reviewer M. Glotz seems to have exaggerated the autonomy of the clan in the seventh century B. C., and to have projected it backwards to the age of origins. He certainly contradicts himself in his description of the decline of *la solidarité familiale* in Athens. On page 50 he affirms that in classic times the initiative in a murder case must come from the relatives of the slain man, while in his fine apology for the study of Greek public law (p. 292), he properly credits Solon with the removal of this restriction. What a difference that makes! Is it right none the less to insist upon the importance (p. 289) of the family in Greek criminal law?

The other essays in the volume deal with the Ordeal (novel and suggestive), the Oath, the Exposure of Children (a sympathetic treatment

in the manner of Duris of Samos), Navy and City from Epos to History, a very pretty edifice which, however, rests on sand so long as the general and exclusive prevalence of the three Doric and the four Ionic tribes is not proved (*cf.* Wilamowitz, *Sitzungsberichte der Berl. Akad.*, 1906, p. 71), the Olympic Games (a graphic and fascinating description). The disquisition on the Oath seems to the reviewer a solid contribution to Greek public law.

W. S. FERGUSON.

Questions d'Histoire et d'Archéologie Chrétienne. Par JEAN GUIRAUD. (Paris: Victor Lecoffre. 1906. Pp. 304.)

UNDER this rather pretentious title M. Guiraud publishes eight essays of very unequal length and merit, and with no discoverable principle of unity except, perhaps, a permeating gratulatory sense of the infallibility of the Roman Church. The questions *d'archéologie* reduce themselves actually to a panegyric on the great "founder of Christian archaeology," de Rossi, and an essay on "L'Esprit de la Liturgie Catholique." The former is an appreciative but entirely obvious review of some of de Rossi's chief discoveries in Roman archaeology: there is not a sign of a critical discussion of a *question d'archéologie*. The latter is simply a review of Dom Fernand Cabral's *Le Livre de la Prière Antique* (Paris, 1900).

It fares somewhat better with the *questions d'histoire*, which include essays on the morals and the liturgy of the Cathari, on the repression of heresy in the Middle Ages, on St. Peter's visit to Rome, on Roman relics in the ninth century, and on St. Dominic's independence of St. Francis in the cult of poverty. Here again it is difficult to discover any *question* in most of the essays. The one on St. Peter at Rome, for example, simply restates the testimony of the fathers from Clement of Rome down to Hippolytus, concluding with the rather humorous confession that the pages are a work of supererogation, since the fact of Peter's Roman residence "n'est plus contesté que par quelques retardataires du protestantisme et du vieux-catholicisme." The phrase is suggestive of the tenor of the whole book: it could enlighten only "retardataires". The essay on "Les Reliques Romaines au IX^e Siècle", which by its title might lead one to expect some discussion of *questions d'archéologie*, is simply the amusing story of deacon Deusdona, the Roman agent for supplying ultramontane monasteries with saints' bones, translated from the *Monumenta Germaniae* (Script., XV., p. 240 *et seqq.*). The author devotes but twelve pages to the interesting question (raised by Sabatier) of the dependence of St. Dominic on St. Francis in his ideas of poverty. He dismisses the enumeration of the goods of the Dominicans in the bull *Religiosam Vitam* (March, 1218) as simply some tithes given by the Church to "the poor" of the monastery of Prouille. But in these few pages the author gives us only an abstract of the arguments already furnished to historical scholars in the lamented Balme's *Cartulaire de St. Dominique*.